



*"People
helping people
help
themselves"*

Michael R. Pence, Governor
State of Indiana

Indiana Family and Social Services Administration
402 W. WASHINGTON STREET, P.O. BOX 7083
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46207-7083

Award Recommendation Letter

To: Nicole Norvell, Director, Division of Disability and Rehabilitative Services
From: Julie Reynolds, Division of Disability and Rehabilitative Services
Subject: Recommendation of Selection for BDDS RFF 15-001, Sheltered Workshop Transition Services
Date: July 6, 2015

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFF 15-001, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Easter Seals ARC of Northeast Indiana, Inc. and Sycamore Services, Inc. be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide Sheltered Workshop Transition Services for the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration.

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

- Estimated Amount of Contract (Easter Seals ARC): \$213,270.00
- Estimated Amount of Contract (Sycamore Services): \$99,267.50

The evaluation team received 10 proposals from:

1. ADEC, Inc. (ADEC)
2. Evansville ARC, Inc. (Evansville ARC)
3. Bona Vista Programs, Inc. (Bona Vista)
4. Carey Services, Inc. (Carey)
5. Easter Seals ARC of Northeast Indiana, Inc. (Easter Seals ARC)
6. Logan Community Resources, Inc. (Logan)
7. Noble, Inc. (Noble)
8. Peak Community Services (Peak)
9. Sycamore Services, Inc. (Sycamore)
10. Wabash Center, Inc. (Wabash)

The proposals were evaluated by FSSA according to the following criteria established in the RFF:

- Adherence to Mandatory Requirements (Pass/Fail)
- Management Assessment/Quality (85 points)
- Cost Proposal (15 points)

The proposals were evaluated according to the process outlined in the RFF. Scoring was completed as follows:

A. Adherence to Requirements

Each proposal was reviewed for adherence to mandatory requirements. All respondents were deemed responsive. Each proposal was then evaluated based on its Business/Technical Proposal, and Cost Proposal.

B. Management Assessment/Quality (85 points)

For the business/technical proposal evaluation, the team considered each respondent's proposal in the following areas:

- Proposer Information
- References
- Qualifications
- Experience
- Staffing
- Vendor Requirements
- Contractor Responsibilities
- Deliverables

The evaluation team's scoring is based on a review of the respondents' proposed approach to each section of the business/technical proposal as well as specific questions that respondents were asked to respond to in the RFF. The initial results of the management assessment/quality evaluation are shown below:

Table 1: Initial Management Assessment/Quality Scores

RESPONDENT	MAQ SCORE (85 Max)
ADEC	36.9
Evansville ARC	40.6
Bona Vista	25.6
Carey	32.8
Easter Seals ARC	56.6
Logan	35.9
Noble	40.9
Peak	23.0
Sycamore	57.2
Wabash	16.7

C. Cost Proposal (15 Points)

Price points were awarded based on the evaluation of the Total Cost per Target Number of Transitioned Individuals (TCTNTI) of each respondent's Cost Proposal. Cost scores are allocated relative to the lowest TCTNTI evaluated. The lowest Cost Proposal receives a total of 15 points. The allocation formula is as follows:

Score = {

- If Respondent's TCTNTI is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 15
- If Respondent's TCTNTI is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is

$$15 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's TCTNTI})}{(\text{Respondent's TCTNTI})}$$

The cost scoring as a result of respondents' initial proposals is as follows:

Table 2: Initial Cost Scores

RESPONDENT	COST SCORE (15 Max)
ADEC	5.8
Evansville ARC	5.0
Bona Vista	13.8
Carey	11.2
Easter Seals ARC	8.3
Logan	6.5
Noble	12.4
Peak	8.5
Sycamore	15.0
Wabash	7.1

D. Short Listing

The combined MAQ and Cost scores from the initial evaluations are listed below.

Table 3: First Round Total Scores

RESPONDENT	TOTAL SCORE (100 Max)	First Round Result
ADEC	42.7	Removed

Evansville ARC	45.6	Removed
Bona Vista	39.4	Removed
Carey	44.0	Removed
Easter Seals ARC	64.9	Short-Listed
Logan	42.5	Removed
Noble	53.3	Removed
Peak	31.4	Removed
Sycamore	72.2	Short-Listed
Wabash	23.8	Removed

Based on the combined MAQ and Cost scores from the initial evaluations, the following Respondents were removed from consideration:

- ADEC
- Evansville ARC
- Bona Vista
- Carey
- Logan
- Noble
- Peak
- Wabash

The remaining respondents were short-listed for further consideration. These short-listed respondents were given an opportunity to meet with the Bureau of Developmental Disabilities Services to give a presentation on their proposal and to respond to clarification questions. The short-listed respondents are listed below:

- Easter Seals ARC
- Sycamore

E. Final Evaluation

After short-listing, the remaining respondents' MAQ were updated based on clarification responses. The final scores for the short-listed respondents after these updates are as follows:

Table 4: Final Evaluation Scores (Short-Listed Respondents Only)

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Total Score
Points Possible	85	15	100
Easter Seals ARC	61.6	8.3	69.9
Sycamore	57.2	15.0	72.2

Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposed business solutions' ability to meet the goals of the program and the needs of the State. The team evaluated proposals based on the stipulated criteria outlined in the RFF document.

This agreement shall be for a period of 10 months from the date of contract execution.